

Attorney Docket No. 108298540US
Disclosure No. 00-0616REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 28 November 2003, the Examiner allowed claims 1-13 and 20-81; rejected claims 14-18 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,626,099 (Amir); and objected to claim 19 as depending on a rejected base claim. The undersigned respectfully submits is that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable from Amir and requests allowance of claims 14-18, as well.

The present Amendment makes a few cosmetic changes in claims 19, 45, 49, and 77. The undersigned respectfully submits that these non-narrowing amendments will not raise any new issues or require any further searching.

In rejecting claims 14-18, the Examiner characterizes Amir's soldering stencil 118 as including first and second sets of solder printing orifices, both bearing the reference number 124, having different orifice sizes. The stencil 118 in Amir is designed for stenciling solder onto contacts of a circuit board onto which at least one die has been mounted. Although some of the apertures 124 in the stencil 118 are smaller than some of the other apertures 124, it appears that these differing sizes allow different types of additional components to be mounted on the circuit board along with the previously mounted die or dies.

Claim 14 calls for a soldering stencil that includes first and second component sets of solder printing orifices. The orifices of the first component set and the orifices of the second component set are configured to correspond to a configuration of contacts of the same single component type. The orifices of the second component set have a size that differs from the size of the orifices of the first component set.

Nothing in Amir suggests that the differently-sized apertures 124 are designed to correspond to contacts of the same single component type. To the contrary, the undersigned's understanding of Amir would dictate that the different sizes of the these apertures 124 would correspond to the contacts or different types of components to be mounted on the circuit board. If the undersigned has overlooked some aspect of Amir suggesting that the differently sized apertures 124 would be used for the same single component type, the undersigned would appreciate the Examiner highlighting the

Attorney Docket No. 108298540US
Disclosure No. 00-0616

relevant portion of Amir. In the absence of such a teaching, Amir cannot anticipate claim 14.

Furthermore, there is nothing in Amir that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to use solder printing orifices having different sizes that are configured to correspond to the configuration of contacts of the same single component type. In the absence of such motivation to modify Amir's disclosure, Amir cannot support even a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, either. Accordingly, claim 14 is patentable over Amir. Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. Because the presently-amended claims will remain allowable over the applied art and these minor corrections neither raise new issues nor necessitate a new search, the undersigned submits that entry of this amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 despite the finality of the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3848.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Edward S. Hotchkiss
Registration No. 33,904

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000